Requirement # 1 – *Meet Functional Requirements With COTS*

Risks

A. COTS fails to meet law/regulatory requirements
Probability: Mod
Impact: High

B. COTS functionality fails to meet user's expectations (look & feel)
Probability: High
Impact: Mod

C. COTS functionality fails to meet management's expectations
Probability: Mod
Impact: Mod

D. Meeting req'ts results (fill the gaps) in augmenting COTS
Probability: High
Impact: Mod

Requirements #1 *Meet Functional Requirements With COTS* (Continued)

Risks

E. S/W solution meets increment #1 req’ts, but not subsequent increments
- **Probability: High**
- **Impact: Mod**

F. Lack of Domain knowledge (contractor team)
- **Probability: Low**
- **Impact: High**

G. Lack of Product knowledge (contractor team)
- **Probability: Low**
- **Impact: High**

H. Lack of timely, access & availability of Gov’t domain knowledge experts
- **Probability: Low/Mod**
- **Impact: High**

Requirements # 2 – Provide Full Function-ality as defined in the SRD by Oct 05

Risks

A. Full functionality can't be provided within the current schedule

Probability: High
Impact: High

B. Users' expectations may not be met with COTS based functionality that can be provided within schedule

Probability: High
Impact: High (if unmitigated)

C. Data conversion/data clean-up will not be completed in time to support OCT 05 req't

Probability: Med
Impact: Mod/High

Requirements # 2 – Provide Full Function-ality as defined in the SRD by Oct 05

Risks

D. Inadequate time to reassess business processes after COTs selection

Probability: High
Impact: Mod

E.

Probability:
Impact:

F.

Probability:
Impact:

Requirements # 3 - Replace or Integrate Current Interfaces

Risks

A. Unable to implement required (68) interfaces as rapidly as planned

Probability: Mod (I/F POCs will be congenial)
Impact: High

B. COTS generated interfaces may not be accepted by interface partners

Probability: Low
Impact: Mod

C. Incoming data req'd for the COTS are not included in current I/Fs

Probability: High
Impact: Mod

D. Outgoing data req'd for the legacy systems are not included in DEAMS COTS

Probability: Mod

Requirements #3 -

Risks

E. Legacy systems will lag DEAMS for the OSD Std Accnt Codes Structure

Probability: High

Impact: Low

B.

Probability:

Impact:

C.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements # 4 - Security

Risks

A. DEAMS data may be assessed as classified due to data aggregation

Probability: High
Impact: Mod/High

B. The selected COTS may not be certified at the required level of security

Probability: High
Impact: High

C. The DEAMS interfaces may not support interoperability with classified systems

Probability: Low
Impact: High

Requirements # 5 - Overlapping Increments

Risks

A. The Gov't/Integrator teams will be unable to support concurrent development of increments due to interdependencies or other technical reasons

Probability:

Impact:

B. Resource constraints may preclude concurrent development of increments within the current schedule

Probability:

Impact:

C. Resource constraints may preclude concurrent development of increments within the current budget

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements # 6 Provide approval and certification process

Risks

A. Non-repudiation requirement cannot be met or waived

Probability:

Impact:

B. Customers unwilling to accept COTS provided electronic certification

Probability:

Impact:

C. If 3rd party COTS is required; then synchronization is necessary

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements # 7 Provide analysis and decision support

Risks

A. Analysis and Decision Support requirements interpreted differently

Probability:

Impact:

B.

Probability:

Impact:

C.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements # 8 Technology refresh of the DEAMS COTS-centric solution

Risks

A. May become unsupportable from the COTS vendors

Probability:

Impact:

B. Refresh may result in unexpected costs growth

Probability:

Impact:

C.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements # 9 COTS solutions must meet CFO compliance requirements

Risks

A. COTS solutions fail to meet CFO compliance requirements

Probability:

Impact:

B.

Probability:

Impact:

C.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements # 10 COTS solution must meet Architectural Requirement

Risks

A. COTS package cannot be integrated into the GCSS-AF and BEA environments

Probability:

Impact:

B.

Probability:

Impact:

C.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements # 11 Rollback if increment #1 fails

Risks

A. Unable to recreate the legacy environment if pilot fails

Probability:

Impact:

B.

Probability:

Impact:

C.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements #12 – Effective Governance

Risks

A. Resolution process not defined nor implemented
- **Probability:** Low
- **Impact:** High

B. Decisions not resolved in a timely manner
- **Probability:** High
- **Impact:** Mod/High

C. Decisions don't "stick"
- **Probability:** Low (Increment #1)/Mod (future increments)
- **Impact:** Mod

D. Req'ts focus (creep) gets lost within gov't leadership
- **Probability:** High
- **Impact:** High

Requirements #13 – Standardized business environment

Risks

A. Expectations can not be properly established

Probability: Low/Med
Impact: Mod

B. Expectations can not be properly met

Probability: High
Impact: High

C. Standard processes are not enforced thru out user community

Probability: Low (if s/w enforces processes)/High
Impact: High

Requirements #14 – Effective Change Mgt

Risks

A. Change management is too narrow in scope

Probability:

Impact:

B.

Probability:

Impact:

C.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements #15 – Acquisition Strategy A – Two Source Selections

Risks

A. No single source of accntablity

Probability:

Impact:

B. Gov't lacks integration experience

Probability:

Impact:

C. Longer Acq timeline shortens execution phase

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements #15 continued

Risks

D. Cost / time of integrator proposal prep is double under Strat A

Probability:

Impact:

E. Gov't will need more resources to learn two COTS products (tech eval's, Conference Room Strat)

Probability:

Impact:

F. Many steps in pre award process could cause schedule slips

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements #15 (Continued)

Risks

G. Config Control of multiple (2-6) integrators & COTS vendor may be too complex for Gov't to integrate

Probability:

Impact:

H. Incentive based contracts are more difficult in this Strategy (both COTS vendors & integrators)

Probability:

Impact:

I. Gov't will spend more time on acquisition than program execution

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements #15 (Continued)

Risks

J. Ineffective Knowledge xfer from one integrator to another (lessons learned)
Probability:
Impact:

K. No continuity on contract team through program life cycle
Probability:
Impact:

L. Customers will be impacted by multiple integrators ability to deliver consist information for training & Help Desk actions
Probability:
Impact:

Requirements #15 (Continued)

Risks

M. Integrator has responsibility for auditability but no control

Probability:

Impact:

N.

Probability:

Impact:

O.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements # 16 – Acquisition Strategy B – Single Source Selection

Risks

A. Potentially more Conference Room fly-offs than Strat A – more resources required

Probability:

Impact:

B. Conference Room Fly offs may cause less potential offerors due to cost of playing

Probability:

Impact:

C. Gov't not paying for fly offs will limit the gov't sol'n to one vendor sol'n(s) vs. combining sol'ns

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements #16 - (Continued)

Risks

D. COTS provider, by themselves, may not be any better at integration than Gov't

Probability:

Impact:

E.

Probability:

Impact:

F.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements #17 – competition for each increment

Risks

A. **Gov't will spend resources on acq vs execution due to incremental concurrency**
   Probability:
   Impact:

B. **Contractor management will be distracted by competing next increment than focusing on current increment**
   Probability:
   Impact:

C. **Contractors decisions will focus more on the next increment than on current**
   Probability:
   Impact:

Requirements #18 – Auditability by FY07

Risks

A. Multiple Integrators may yield multiple sol'ns which can result in auditability problems

Probability:

Impact:

B.

Probability:

Impact:

C.

Probability:

Impact:

Requirements #19 – Sustaining High Performance Thru Out Duration of Contract

Risks

A. Lack of sustained commitment by DoD to DEAMS
- **Probability:** High
- **Impact:** High

B. Funding instability
- **Probability:** Mod
- **Impact:** High

C. Other new or conflicting programs divert Industry attention
- **Probability:** High
- **Impact:** Mod

D. Lack of measurable performance standards (agreed to)
- **Probability:** Low
- **Impact:** Mod

Requirements # 19 – Sustaining High Performance Thru Out Duration of Contract

Risks

E. Lack of process to enforce performance standards (agreed to)
Probability: Mod
Impact: Mod

F. Intellectual capital monopolized by single COTS vendor &/or integrator
Probability: Mod
Impact: Mod

G. Lack of alternatives will not permit sustaining high performance
Probability: Mod
Impact: High

H. Lack of joint accountability by all stakeholders (legacy, Infrastructure Providers, future increment customers)